
Darius and His Behistun Inscription

Author(s): A. T. Olmstead

Source: *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Oct., 1938), pp. 392-416

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3088120>

Accessed: 23/02/2010 07:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*.

DARIUS AND HIS BEHISTUN INSCRIPTION

A. T. OLMSTEAD

Almost a century has elapsed since Henry Rawlinson deciphered the great rock inscription of Darius I at Behistun, which still retains its pre-eminence among the impressive monuments out of man's past.¹ No other ancient oriental record, the Bible alone excepted, has so enormous a bibliography, yet, despite the labors of generations of scholars, much has remained obscure. Our greatest difficulty has been the chronology, for, while some of the months given in the Persian original or in the Elamite translation have been determined by the known months of the Akkadian and Aramaic versions, the others have been much disputed. Thanks to the great tablet find of Professor Ernst Herzfeld's excavations for the Oriental Institute at Persepolis, Professor Arno Poebel has been enabled to determine the order of the Elamite months and so of the Persian, and has presented with full discussion in tabular form the results of this discovery as applied to the Behistun inscription.²

For nearly thirty years I have given my classes an interpretation of the Behistun inscription which in certain respects differs radically from that of Professor Poebel. The story of this period has long been written up in the rough draft of Achaemenid history which was used for my *History of Palestine and Syria* and which will be incorporated in my forthcoming *History of New Testament Times in the Near East*. Once

¹ H. C. Rawlinson, "The Persian Cuneiform Inscription at Behistun," *JRAS*, Vol. X (1847); for earlier progress in decipherment cf. R. W. Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria* (6th ed.; 1915), I, 21 ff.; definitive edition, L. W. King and R. C. Thompson, *The Sculptures and Inscription of Darius the Great on the Rock of Behistun in Persia* (1907); cf. F. H. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden* (1911). Rawlinson employed for the place name the form given by the medieval Arab geographer Yaqut, *s.v.*, and by this it has become known to literally millions of English and American readers; some scholars prefer the modern Bisitun or Bisutun—the spelling has not been standardized officially—but in an article intended for a nontechnical audience the familiar Behistun would seem advisable.

² Arno Poebel, "The Names and the Order of the Old Persian and Elamite Months during the Achaemenian Period," *AJSL*, LV (1938), 130 ff.; "Chronology of Darius' First Year of Reign," *ibid.*, pp. 142 ff. and 285 ff.; the more important discussions of the chronological problems are there cited.

more it has been revised in the light of the new dating evidence; as will be seen, there is still more dating evidence to be utilized.³

Once we have obtained the true month-by-month chronology of the Behistun inscription, it is possible to go one step farther and to date with some accuracy the events by the actual year, month, and day of our own era. Sidersky has proved that the nineteen-year cycle of intercalation, employed to bring together at its end the solar and lunar years, was introduced by the Babylonian monarch Nabu-nasir in 747 B.C.; that it was revised at the beginning of its twenty-first cycle in 367 B.C. (by the distinguished astronomer Kidinnu, as I believe); and that henceforth it continued without the slightest change until the middle of the first century after Christ. By means of tables compiled with the aid of Dr. Waldo H. Dubberstein, it is possible to date any event after 367 B.C. with a possible though not probable error of two days.

Later, Sidersky gave us a table showing the length of each year, the intercalated month of the embolistic years, and the day of the month (according to our reckoning) on which came each New Year's Day. Unfortunately, the system by which after 367 B.C. the intercalated month, Second Addaru or Second Ululu, was inserted in a definite year of the cycle had not yet been fully worked out; more recent material on the intercalated months collected by Dr. Dubberstein permits further check, and our table is slowly assuming more perfect form. We can now be absolutely sure of the date at the beginning of each nineteen-year cycle; although there is the possibility that at any given point our dating may be one month off, in a year or two this error rectifies itself, so that the chance of a month's error is something like one in five.⁴

The autobiography of Darius I, like the similar *Res Gestae* of Augustus, is a most precious document, but like all such memoirs challenges the criticism of the historian. It is an official as well as a personal document, therefore written with full opportunity to know the

³ In its revised form, this discussion is based on the editions of the Elamite and Persian inscriptions prepared by Dr. George G. Cameron for his card-catalogue dictionaries of Old Persian and Elamite; cf. my report in J. H. Breasted, *The Oriental Institute* (1933), p. 393.

⁴ D. Sidersky, *Etude sur la chronologie assyro-babylonienne* (1916); "Contribution à l'étude de la chronologie néo-babylonienne," *RA*, XXX (1933), 57 ff. Cf. A. T. Olmstead, "Babylonian Astronomy," *AJSL*, LV (1938), 113 ff.

truth and with every inducement to suppress or distort those facts which are inconvenient. At the very beginning, Darius boasts of his descent through Vishtaspa, Arshama, Ariyaramna, and Chishpish from the founder Hakhamanish; "therefore are we called Achaemenids. From long ago we are princely, from long ago our family was royal. Eight of my family were formerly kings, I am the ninth; nine are we in two lines."⁵

Long doubted, recent discoveries have proved this statement literally true, though not quite in the sense Darius would have us believe. His line had indeed been the elder, and under Ariyaramna had the precedence, but Median conquest had leveled both to a common vassalage. Successful revolt against the Median Astyages had brought the younger line to power under Cyrus, Cambyses, and Bardiya; while Darius' grandfather, Arshama, remained at best a petty kinglet or noble, his father, Vishtaspa, was fortunate to be satrap of Parthia and Hyrcania, and Darius himself at twenty-eight was king's spearbearer by the side of Cambyses.⁶

How so young a man reached so exalted a position while both father and grandfather were living⁷ is explained in his autobiography. There was a man of his family, Cambyses by name, son of Cyrus, who was king. Cambyses had a brother, Bardiya by name, of the same father and mother. Afterward Cambyses slew that brother, but it was not known to the people that Bardiya was slain. After Cambyses went to Egypt, the people became rebellious, the Lie was great in the lands. Afterward a Magush (Magian), Gaumata by name, arose and lyingly claimed to be that Bardiya; he rose from Pishiyauvada⁸ of Mount

⁵ Beh., §§ 1 ff.

⁶ Herod. i. 209, iii. 139; Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 2, 46; cf. G. G. Cameron, *History of Early Iran*, pp. 179 f. and 212 ff.

⁷ Beh., § 35; cf. § 13 and see below; Susa Charter, ll. 13 ff.; Xerxes, Persepolis Inscription, ll. 17 ff. (E. Herzfeld, *A New Inscription of Xerxes from Persepolis* [1932]).

⁸ "I have sometimes supposed it (Pishiyauvada) ought to be the original of the Greek πασαργάδαι, but there is nothing to favor the identity beyond the partial resemblance of orthography"; this criticism of H. Rawlinson, *JRAS*, X (1847), 234 n., still applies, though later scholars, e.g., Poebel, "Chronology of Darius' First Year of Reign," *op. cit.*, p. 160, have revived the identification. The identification becomes even less plausible when we investigate the original name of Cyrus' capital. This is generally given by the few Greeks who mention it as Pasargadae, but a contemporary of the later Achaemenids, Anaximenes, fr. 19 (Jacoby), translates "Camp of the Persians"; such a translation cannot possibly be obtained from either Pasargadae or Pishiyauvada, but it can be secured from the form used by Quintus Curtius v. 20, 10; x. 1, 22: Parsagada, variants Persagada, Persagara. (The *Frasargida* of the printed editions of Pliny *Hist. nat.* vi. 116 cannot be pressed; it is con-

Arakadrish March 11 (Addaru 14), 522.⁹ All the people abandoned Cambyses and went over to the pretender, the kingdom he took for himself July 1 (Duzu 9).¹⁰ Cambyses died. Now this kingdom had belonged from ancient times to Darius' family—we have already seen just how far this claim was justified. No man, not even one of his own family, could take the kingdom from that Gaumata. People feared exceedingly lest he slay the many who had known the true Bardiya, "that he may not know me that I am not Bardiya, son of Cyrus." Nothing dared be said until Darius arrived — from where unfortunately he does not state.¹¹ By the will of Auramazda and with the assistance of the "Seven," whose names are listed later, Darius slew that Gaumata and his allies September 29 (Tashritu 10), 522, at the fort Sikayauvatish in the Median district of Nisaya. By the will of Auramazda, Darius became king.

The power taken from his family Darius restored; he established it on its foundations as it was formerly. He rebuilt the temples Gaumata had destroyed; he restored to the folk the pasture lands, cattle herds, and dwellings which the Magian had seized; he labored until it was as if Gaumata had never taken away the family house.

Such was the official version, followed by the Father of History and his Greek successors.¹² Yet there are not lacking indications that it was not quite true to the facts. We have already observed that Darius belonged to the former imperial family only in the broader sense. Xenophon tells us that before his death Cyrus made his younger son,

jecture from the readings Asargida, Asarcida, Phidasarchda, and Satarchida.) From Anaximenes and Quintus Curtius we obtain the first element, Parsa, the same element Xerxes uses for what we call Persepolis. Herzfeld, *Paikuli*, pp. 68 and 227, has plausibly suggested that the early Hellenistic Persepolis coins which are inscribed Parsa-BΛΠΤΗΑ should be read Parsastakhra, "Parsa the Fort," later contracted to Istakhr; "Camp," στρατοπέδον, of the Anaximenes passage, is therefore presumably a name of somewhat similar meaning, and we may find it in the last element of such names as the Sasanid Darabgerd, Dastagerd, or the Armenian Tigranocerta.

⁹ See the chronological table at the end of this article.

¹⁰ That Garmapada, "warm station," was certainly Duzu was pointed out by H. C. Tolman, *American Journal of Philology*, XXXII (1911), 444 ff., who correctly restored the Aramaic version to T[ammuz], not T[ishri], as did the editor Sachau.

¹¹ Herod. iii. 70 says to Susa from Persia; according to Darius himself, Gaumata was killed far from Susa, which also was in revolt; nor can Persia be taken to mean Parthia, his father's satrapy. According to Herod. iii. 139, Darius was spearbearer of Cambyses in Egypt; he should now be returning from the army in the west.

¹² Beh., §§ 10 ff.; Herod. iii. 30, 61 ff.; Plato *Epist.* vii. 332A; *Laws* 95B; Just. i. 9, 4 ff.; Polyæn. vii. 11, 2.

here called Tanaoxares, satrap of Media, Armenia, and Cadusia.¹³ Herodotus says that the subject peoples welcomed gladly the false Smerdis, as he suspended for three years the taxes and war levies; the Behistun inscription implies that he incurred the dislike of the feudal nobles by the destruction of the temples they controlled, doubtless in a centralization of the cult.¹⁴

The murder of the "true" Bardiya is placed before the Egyptian expedition of Cambyses by Darius, during it by Herodotus, after it by Ctesias; the disagreement on this crucial date is ominous. The official version blamed Prexaspes for the actual murder, but there was doubt as to the place and the manner, whether killed while hunting near Susa or drowned in the Erythraean Sea! After the death of Cambyses, the official version continues, Prexaspes recanted and then in repentance "committed suicide." Deathbed confessions are frequent devices of the propagandist, after a "suicide" the dead man can tell no tales to the contrary, and in such cases the historian is always suspicious. Though he follows this official version, Herodotus goes so far as to assert that so like were the "true" and the "false" Smerdis that even the mother and sisters were deceived! Also, the "false" Smerdis was false only in claiming to be son of Cyrus; his name actually was Smerdis. Contemporary Aeschylus has no doubt that Mardos was a legitimate monarch, killed by the wiles not of Darius but of Artaphrenes, one of the "Seven," whom Hellanicus called Daphernes.¹⁵ Xenophon declares that, as soon as Cyrus was dead, immediately *his sons* began civil dissensions.¹⁶ Needful legitimization of usurped rule may be seen in the marriages of Darius to Atossa and Artystone, daughters of Cyrus; to Phaedyne, daughter of one of the "Seven" (Otanes), who like

¹³ Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 7, 11; Ctes. 29, 8 gives as the territory of "Tanyoxarces" Chorasnia, Parthia, and Carmania, which is less plausible.

¹⁴ E. Herzfeld, *Archaeological History of Iran*, p. 39, assuming that Bardiya was actually the false Gaumata, assigns to his time a figure in old Persian dress adorning a fire altar and accompanied by a smaller priest, found near the ancient bone boxes at Sakwand, south of Behistun near Harsin, which he identifies as Sikayauvatish.

¹⁵ Aeschyl. *Persae* 774 ff.; Hellanicus *Pers.* 181 (Jacoby).

¹⁶ Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8, 2. It is generally asserted that the last chapter of Book viii is not by Xenophon. We must admit that chap. 7 brings the work to an artistic close; the last chapter must be a later addition. But the most superficial reading proves that it must have been written during the great satrapial revolt under Artaxerxes II—in other words, during the last years of Xenophon. Complete disillusion of a weary old man, who had seen his favorite Persians and Spartans go to pieces without hope of revival, sufficiently explains the peevish tone of this additional comment, which contrasts the good old times with the degenerate present.

Atossa had been wife of Cambyses and Bardiya; and to Bardiya's own daughter Parmys.¹⁷ Last but very far from least, Darius so continuously insists that all his opponents—the “false” Bardiya in particular—were “liars,” we are convinced “he doth protest too much.”¹⁸

Herodotus tells us that his pseudo-Smerdis ruled seven months;¹⁹ Darius dates the uprising March 11 (Addaru 14) but says that it was not until July 1 (Duzu 9) that Bardiya was able to make himself king, while his death was Tashritu 10, apparently of the same year, and in this case September 29. This does not at all agree with the tablets from Babylonia.

During the reign of Cambyses, the tablets published by Strassmaier run in a regular series with only rarely a month missing; over the entire period they average a little over four tablets a month. For the first month, Nisannu, of Cambyses' eighth year, Strassmaier gives the normal four tablets: two from Sippar, one not localized, the last, April 29 (Nisannu 23), 522, from Shaherinu in Sippar's vicinity. Two other tablets from South Babylonia are also dated in Nisannu.²⁰ Thus more than a month after Bardiya's revolt the news had not yet reached Babylonia, but some time between May 8 and June 5 (Aiaru, no day), and so a month or two before Darius admits his rule, Babylonia counted the accession year of “Barzia, king of Babylon, king of lands.”²¹ Another tablet from his accession year is dated Simannu 6; still another, from Uruk, Duzu 15.²² All remaining docu-

¹⁷ Herod. iii. 68, 88; vii. 224.

¹⁸ Cf. P. Rost, *MVAG*, II (1897), 208 ff.; H. Winckler, *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte* (1889), pp. 128 ff.; J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, II, 345, n. 1. Note the defense of lying put into the mouth of Darius in Herod. iii. 72.

¹⁹ Herod. iii. 67.

²⁰ J. Strassmaier, “Babylonische Texte,” *Cambyzes* (1890), Nos. 406–9; A. Tremayne, *Records from Erech* (1925), No. 196; R. P. Dougherty, *Goucher College Babylonian Collection* (1918), No. 106. Of year eight is also L. Speleers, *Recueil des inscriptions de l'Asie antérieure* ... (1925), No. 284. Three other tablets, Nos. 410–12, are assigned by Strassmaier to year eight. Of these, No. 410 has a broken date but is to be restored as of year seven (a reference to Duzu of year eight is anticipative); No. 411 has a broken date and is uncertain; No. 412 is clearly Shabatu 27, year eight, from Sippar, but is certainly miswritten or miscopied. As shown above, for the whole reign the documents in Strassmaier average a trifle over four documents per month; it is quite impossible to believe that, while the first month had the average, for the remainder of the ten months to Shabatu we should have a total of but one or at most two. Cf. J. Prašek, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Altertums* (1897); F. H. Weissbach, “Zur Chronologie des Kambyses,” *ZDMG*, LI (1897), 661 ff.; “Zur Neubabylonischen und Achämenidischen Chronologie,” *ibid.*, LXII (1908), 631, n. 1.

²¹ J. Strassmaier, *ZA*, IV (1889), 147 f., No. 1.

²² *VAS*, IV, No. 85; Dougherty, *op. cit.*, No. 132.

ments are from his first year, 521: from Huba, dated Nisannu 19; from Sippar, Simannu 23 and 26 and Duzu 23;²³ from Babylon, Duzu 27;²⁴ Abu 4;²⁵ Abu 20;²⁶ two on Ululu 10;²⁷ from Nippur and Babylon on Ululu 13;²⁸ from Nippur and from Zazanna, Ululu 15;²⁹ from Babylon, Ululu 20 and Tashritu 1;³⁰ the last date is Arahsamna 11, Babylon.³¹ In view of all this evidence, we must admit that Bardiya was accepted throughout Babylonia. Furthermore, we can no longer argue with Oppert that "accession year" and "first year" are the same calendar year.³² We must then admit that Bardiya was acknowledged in Babylonia for over a year and that his death took place Tashritu 10 not of 522 but of 521, and so must correspond to our October 17 of that year. Of necessity it follows that all the following dates in Poebel's tables must be dropped one year or more.

Immediately after the protocol Darius gives us a list of his provinces and only much later a list of those which "revolted." Evidently he would have us believe that after his assassination of the "false" Bardiya all the provinces of the empire accepted his rule. His claim is accepted by Poebel: "We have no reason to doubt or qualify this statement. . . . Darius is therefore quite correct, not only in his statement that immediately after his accession to the throne the whole empire obeyed his orders, but also in designating every uprising as a revolt (against himself)."³³

Let us test Darius' claim. We may expect Arshama to have favored his grandson, but whether he had any power is doubtful. Vishtaspa, his father, was satrap of Parthia and Hyrcania. Neither gave any aid in the usurpation, and in Parthia itself was a party which did not accept Darius as king.³⁴ Two other satraps also declared for Darius,

²³ Strassmaier, *ZA*, IV, Nos. 2-5.

²⁵ Strassmaier, *ZA*, IV, No. 6.

²⁴ *VAS*, VI, No. 117.

²⁶ *VAS*, V, No. 57.

²⁷ *VAS*, IV, No. 86; Strassmaier, "Die babylonischen Inschriften im Museum zu Liverpool," *Actes du 6^e Congrès international des Orientalistes à Leide*, II (1885), 569 ff., No. 22.

²⁸ *BE*, VIII, No. 100; Strassmaier, "Die babylonischen Inschriften . . .," p. 572.

²⁹ *BE*, VIII, No. 101; Strassmaier, *ZA*, IV, No. 7.

³⁰ Strassmaier, *ibid.*, Nos. 8 f.

³¹ T. G. Pinches, *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, I (1887), 54. The correction of *Bar-zi-ia* for *Tar-zi-ia* (the bar sign being almost identical with the *tar* in this period) is generally accepted; cf. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, 1894, p. 273; 1900, pp. 959 ff.; F. H. Weissbach, *ZDMG*, LV (1901), 209.

³² J. Oppert, "Le Canon des dates babyloniennes," *Compte rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions* (1892), pp. 410 ff.

³³ Poebel, "Chronology," *op. cit.*, pp. 147 f.

³⁴ *Beh.*, §§ 13 and 35.

Dadarshish of Bactria and Vivana of Arachosia, though in the latter there was also an opposition.³⁵ Poebel notes that, in addition to Bactria, Sogdiana, Areia, Drangiana, Maka, Cappadocia, Sardis, Ionia, the Sea Provinces, and Arabia do not occur in the list of rebellious countries or in any uprising.³⁶ This is true, but the list requires analysis. Bactria was held loyal by Dadarshish, who may also have kept in control Sogdiana, Areia, and Drangiana, yet this is not probable—it is much more likely that Sogdiana on the far border of the empire was cut off completely by revolted Margiana and attacked by “rebel” Saka.³⁷ With the alternate road through Bactria blocked by Dadarshish, the only possible route for the army sent by Vahyazdata to Arachosia lay through Areia and Drangiana, which must therefore have been in their possession. Herodotus specifically declares that the Arabs were never actually subject but were friendly.³⁸ Maka must have been in the same position; whether the tribesmen obeyed or not meant little in the crisis. Of Cappadocia we know nothing, except that its neighbor Armenia, with which Cappadocia was in history always so closely connected, was in revolt. In Sardis, the satrap Oroetes, appointee of Cyrus, not only refused aid to Darius—to an oriental king a sure sign of disloyalty—but he killed the satrap of Dascylium, “Those of the Sea” of the Persian inscriptions, and later the “king’s messenger.” Ionia was not a true satrapy under its own satrap; it was always a group of “free” Greek cities under the supervision of the satrap at Sardis, that is, of Oroetes, as the passage of Herodotus to which we owe this information expressly indicates.³⁹

Thus we may state with assurance that the claim of Darius is false, that while, as he admits, the whole empire accepted Bardiya, when Bardiya was murdered almost the whole empire broke out in a perfect orgy of revolt against the assassin. Darius admits he had few soldiers at his command; fortune favored the usurper, who acted against divided foes with the vigor to be expected of a man of twenty-eight.

First in the list of “rebels” are given Hashshina, son of Ukbatarra-ma of Elam,⁴⁰ and Nidintu-Bel, son of Aniri, of Babylon, who, we may

³⁵ Beh., §§ 38 and 45.

³⁶ Poebel, “Chronology,” *op. cit.*, p. 148.

³⁷ That the Saka at this time were under Skunkha or indeed that his Saka were the same as those here mentioned is by no means certain.

³⁸ Herod. iii. 88.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 126 f.

⁴⁰ Elamite proper names are given in the Elamite form.

assume, "revolted" at the same time. Hashshina is pictured with low outpointing nose, pronounced cheekbones, mustache, and firm, shaved chin; Darius sent to Elam, the "rebel" was bound, forwarded, and killed.⁴¹ "Afterward" Darius marched against Nidintu-Bel, for whom we have considerable outside information which is decisive.

As preliminary, we must investigate the problem of the third and fourth Nebuchadnezzars. So long ago as 1878, in an article which still remains the foundation for all discussions of this period, W. St. Chad Boscawen noted that a whole group of tablets dated by the accession year or first year of a Nebuchadnezzar could not be assigned to the biblical ruler of that name but must be assigned to Nebuchadnezzar III, the Nidintu-Bel of our inscription; the proof he found in the frequent occurrence of Itti-Marduk-balatu, head of the well-known Egibi firm, whose floruit was already fixed from the days of Nabu-aid to those of Darius, and of his son Marduk-nasir-apal.⁴² In this he was followed by several writers,⁴³ but unfortunately Strassmaier, in his edition of the documents belonging to Nebuchadnezzar II, included these later tablets; as a result, Boscawen's discovery was thereafter often ignored.⁴⁴

While members of my oriental seminar in 1930-31, Dr. George Cameron and Dr. Waldo Dubberstein prepared a study on the third and fourth Nebuchadnezzars which has since been brought up to date by inclusion of later published texts. Their detailed investigations, involving a check on every single individual mentioned, deserve publication in full; meanwhile I have been permitted to utilize their results.

Bardiya had been murdered Tashritu 10 (October 17), 521, but the news had not yet reached Babylon a month later, for a tablet was dated by him November 17 (Arahsamna 11).⁴⁵ By Kislimu 7, from Borsippa,⁴⁶ and Kislimu 10 and the day following,⁴⁷ we find tablets

⁴¹ Beh., §§ 16 ff.

⁴² W. St. Chad Boscawen, *TSBA*, VI (1878), 31 ff., 68.

⁴³ E.g., C. P. Tiele, *Babylonisch-assyrische Geschichte* (1886), p. 477, n. 3; J. Oppert, "Les Inscriptions du Pseudo-Smerdis," *Actes du 8^e Congrès international des Orientalistes à Stockholm*, II B (1893), 255; G. Maspero, *Passing of the Empires* (1900), p. 675, n. 2.

⁴⁴ J. Strassmaier, "Babylonische Texte," *Nabuchodonosor* (1889).

⁴⁵ T. G. Pinches, *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, I, 54.

⁴⁶ Oluf Krückmann, *Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungstexte*, No. 6.

⁴⁷ Strassmaier, *Nab.*, Nos. 9 f.

dated in the accession year of this third Nebuchadnezzar.⁴⁸ According to Darius, his true name was Nidintu-Bel, son of Aniri, pictured on the Behistun relief as an old man whose deeply seamed cheeks, short upper lip, and outpointing beard served as foil to the short nose with enormous bulge; to his subjects he was Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabunaid. Thus twenty-six days after the Babylonians were still dating by Bardiya they had recognized Nebuchadnezzar III; it is therefore Darius who is "lying" when he claims that he was accepted in Babylonia, and we wonder if this is the only lie in the inscription.

At present, there is a break of six months in our evidence, though the gradual appearance of fresh tablets gives hope that in time the break will be filled.⁴⁹ The series continues in year one, 520, from Babylon, Duzu, no day;⁵⁰ probably from Uruk, Ululu 2;⁵¹ from Babylon, Ululu 14;⁵² from Borsippa, Ululu 15;⁵³ probably from Uruk, Tashritu 1,⁵⁴ as is certainly Tashritu 13;⁵⁵ from Babylon Tashritu 16;⁵⁶ thus the last date of Nebuchadnezzar III is October 12, 520. Darius therefore could not have begun his march against Babylon until autumn, 520, and the remaining dates in Poebel's tables must be lowered, at least for Babylonia, another year or two years in all.

Nebuchadnezzar III had stationed troops in the reed thickets of the Tigris to seize the boats and to guard the crossing; Darius outflanked them by transporting troops across the river on inflated skins, quite as we see them depicted on Assyrian reliefs or as we have seen them in our own day. This force was defeated December 20 (Kislimu 26). A second battle December 26 (Tabitu 2), at Zazanna⁵⁷ on the Euphrates with the "rebel" himself was decisive. When the enemy was driven into the water, Nebuchadnezzar III with a few horsemen fled to Babylon, which however was quickly taken and the Babylonian slain.⁵⁸

⁴⁸ The date of the Pinches tablet, Arahsamna 11, still Bardiya, prevents us from assigning to Nebuchadnezzar III the tablets in Strassmaier, *Nab.*, Nos. 3-5, 7 f., accession year of Nebuchadnezzar, which are dated too early; they must be assigned to the fourth Nebuchadnezzar; see below.

⁴⁹ As will be seen below, this break is not that of the fourth Nebuchadnezzar.

⁵⁰ Strassmaier, *Nab.*, No. 12.

⁵¹ Contenau, *TCL*, XII, No. 22.

⁵³ Krückmann, *op. cit.*, No. 150.

⁵² Strassmaier, *Nab.*, No. 13.

⁵⁴ Contenau, *op. cit.*, No. 23.

⁵⁵ J. B. Nies and C. F. Keiser, *Historical, Religious, and Economic Texts* (1920), No. 99.

⁵⁶ Strassmaier, *Nab.*, No. 17.

⁵⁷ Also in Strassmaier, *ZA*, IV, 150, No. 7.

⁵⁸ *Beh.*, §§ 18 ff.; Herod. iii. 150 ff., twenty-month siege.

Four days after the battle, December 30 (Tabitu 6), 520, Babylon was dating by the "year of the beginning of the reign of Darius, king of Babylon, king of lands."⁵⁹ Thereafter we have dated tablets for each remaining month of the accession year and for every month of the first year except Duzu and Arah-samna.⁶⁰ We naturally assume that this means Darius was undoubted king of Babylonia throughout his first year. But there are serious objections to this assumption.

After the execution of Nebuchadnezzar III, Darius informs us, he departed for Media and Persia. While there, Babylon again revolted at the instigation of Arakha, son of Haldita, who rose at Duba-la. Although called an Armenian, he was not of the recent Aryan hordes, for his father's name revered Haldish, god of the older Haldian population, and his flat nose, narrow, half-closed eyes, straight hair, and spiked, outthrust beard show that he came from this older stratum. He likewise called himself Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabu-naid, and his tablets should also be found among those attributed to Nebuchadnezzar II.

Now we do have a group of such tablets dated by a Nebuchadnezzar, where the names of the contracting parties prove beyond doubt that they belong to this general period, but it has proved impossible to assign them to Nebuchadnezzar III. They all come from the accession year and are all from Babylon. The earliest is of Duzu 14 (July 2);⁶¹ it is impossible to assign this to the accession year of Nebuchadnezzar III, for we have a tablet dated by Bardiya as late as Arah-samna 11, and the same is true of four other tablets of Tashritu 20; of Tashritu, day lost; of Arah-samna 7 and 10.⁶² By elimination we assign these tablets to Nebuchadnezzar IV. It may be objected that

⁵⁹ F. H. Weissbach, *Babylonische Miscellen* (1903), pp. 48 f., No. 16.

⁶⁰ For proof it is unnecessary to go beyond the tablets in Strassmaier, *Darius*, Nos. 1-29. But these tablets also prove that the six-month break in the tablets of Nebuchadnezzar III is not the time when we should draw the line between Nebuchadnezzar III and IV. We have already seen that the date of the first tablet assigned to Nebuchadnezzar III comes twenty-six days after the last dated by Bardiya, the last assigned to Nebuchadnezzar III is seventy days before the first battle, the first dated by Darius is four days after the second battle. As our documents run, this is a remarkably close fit; equally convincing is the negative evidence. If the documents in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar III are assigned to Nebuchadnezzar IV, not only should we have no tablets from his accession year, we should have Darius from Tabitu 16 to Simannu 21, Nebuchadnezzar IV in Duzu, Darius Abu 17, Nebuchadnezzar Ululu 2 and 14, Darius Ululu 27, Nebuchadnezzar Tashritu 1, 13, 16, Darius in Tashritu, which is obviously absurd.

⁶¹ A. Ungnad, *ZA*, XIX (1906), 416, n. 1; *OLZ*, X (1907), 465.

⁶² Strassmaier, *Nab.*, Nos. 4 f., 7 f.

there are tablets from these months dated by the first year of Darius; a closer analysis shows that, while all the tablets assigned to Nebuchadnezzar IV come from Babylon, during the same period there are none from that city dated by Darius, all of whose dated tablets during this stretch of time are from or can be shown to come from Sippar or its vicinity.⁶³ Therefore the fourth Nebuchadnezzar was confined to Babylon, where he ruled from July 2 to October 24, 519. We can understand why Darius thought it sufficient to send his general Vindafarna (Intaphernes), one of the "Seven," who made Nebuchadnezzar IV captive November 5 (Arahsamna 22), 519, twelve days after his last dated tablet; by order of Darius he was killed in Babylon.⁶⁴ Ush-tannu, the Tattenai of the Bible, supplanted Gubaru (Gobryas) as governor (*pahatu*) of Babylon and Ebir Nari by February 27 (Addaru 18), 518.⁶⁵

If we are to believe Darius, it was while he was in Babylon that the various lands revolted; this would imply that they revolted toward the end of 520 and that the expeditions against them took place in 519. While the latter conclusion is for the most part correct, the former is dubious; we have seen that his claim of acceptance by the whole empire is certainly false for Elam, Babylonia, and Sardis. Furthermore, the Babylonian tablets prove false the repeated claim that he made the majority of his expeditions "in the same year after I became king."⁶⁶ The claim is later qualified by the statement: "This is what I did in the [seco]nd and t[hird] years after I became king."⁶⁷ With the new month identifications assured by Poebel, it is indeed possible to combine all the following campaigns into little more than a calendar year, though covering parts of two regnal years.

On this assumption, the next dated event would be the defeat of Frada of Margiana by Dadarshish, satrap of Bactria, December 17 (Kislimu 23), 520.⁶⁸ Against this assumption is the appearance of the

⁶³ To the listed tablets from the first year add Krückmann, *op. cit.*, No. 163.

⁶⁴ Beh., §§ 49 ff.

⁶⁵ Strassmaier, *Dar.*, No. 27; No. 82, of Tashritu, year two; A. T. Clay, *BRLM*, Vol. I, No. 101, sixth year (so Dubberstein).

⁶⁶ Beh., §§ 52, 56 ff., 62; there has been much discussion as to the exact rendering of *hamahyāyā tharda*, but the conventional translation cannot be far wrong.

⁶⁷ Beh., § 71; this is the most plausible restoration, fitting best the chronology; at least there can be no doubt that Darius is here revising his claim of a single year's campaigning, and that the campaigns did not end for at least three years.

⁶⁸ Beh., §§ 38 f.

defeat so late in the narrative and in the summary of the "liars";⁶⁹ in its favor is the position of Frada in the group of captive kings on the relief.⁷⁰ Thus there is no clear evidence of date, and the battle may have taken place earlier than 520, as it was only an engagement of a satrap, not of Darius himself.

Frada, a flat-nosed, pointed-bearded man, is in the main account called "leader" of Margush, Margiana, the flat plains about Merv; here the title of king is denied him. Perhaps there is a reason. While at his father's court in Parthia, Darius must have become well acquainted with Vishtaspa's protégé, the prophet Zoroaster; reminiscences of his language are common in Darius' inscriptions, in the unpublished second inscription on his tomb Darius actually cites one of Zoroaster's Gathas.⁷¹ Under the patronage of Vishtaspa, the prophet had spent many happy years, but his last days had been clouded by nomad invasions and he must preach the holy war against the invaders.⁷² Yashts, which in their present form are somewhat later but which contain much early material, some of it pre-Zoroastrian, quote prayers of Vishtaspa or of Zairivairi for success against such enemies as Thathryavant, Peshana, Peshochingha, Humayaka, Darshinika, Spinjaurushka, and Ashta-aurvant, son of Vispa-thaurvoashti; they refer to wars with Arejat-aspas of Hyaona.⁷³ Still later tradition informs us that Arejat-aspas took Balkh by assault and murdered Zoroaster and his disciples at the altar.⁷⁴ Zoroaster must actually have died just about this time; if there is truth in the tradition, Frada or one of his fellow-nomads may have been the assassin. Darius ends the account: "This was what was done by me in *Bactria*"; the meaning is clear: Dadarshish, satrap of Bactria, drove off an attempted invasion of Bactria by Frada. The account does not mention the capture of

⁶⁹ Beh., § 52.

⁷⁰ Herzfeld, in F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, *Felsreliefs*, p. 197, remarks: "Ein Gedanke drängt sich da auf, nämlich, dass es die Reihenfolge ist, in der sie gefangen, d.h. in der die Aufstände beendet wurden. Meines Wissens ist dieser Umstand noch nicht durchgeprüft und historisch verwertet worden, und doch könnte er geeignet sein, ein neues Licht auf die trotz allen aufgewandten Scharfsinnes noch immer dunkle Chronologie der Inschrift zu werfen." So also Poebel, "Chronology," *op. cit.*, p. 162. Assuredly, it cannot be the order of revolt, as is shown by the case of Nidintu-Bel.

⁷¹ E. Herzfeld, *Archaeological History of Iran*, p. 43.

⁷² Yasna 53:8 f., 28; a life of Zoroaster, based solely on his own Gathas, has been completed by the writer; it will shortly be published in the *Review of Religion*.

⁷³ Yasht 5:109, 113; 9:29 ff.; 17:49 ff.; 19:87.

⁷⁴ A. V. Williams Jackson, *Zoroaster*, pp. 118 ff.

Frada, a surprising omission unless he escaped; his name in the list of the captured "liar kings" and his appearance on the reliefs are not good evidence to the contrary. When Frada's repulse was followed up by the reconquest of Margiana is unknown.

If we continue our attempt to compress all the chief campaigns in one calendar year, we must next consider a group of events, closely connected in time. The general of Vivana, satrap of Arachosia, defeated a body of troops sent by Vahyazdata of Parsa at the fort Kaphishakanish on January 6 (Tabitu 13), 519.⁷⁵ Two days later, January 8 (Tabitu 15), the general Vaumisa won a victory at Izalla (Elamite Iṣṣila) in Assyria, the modern Tur Abdin complex of hills.⁷⁶ Though the army of Medes and Persians with Darius in Babylonia was small, he sent a detachment under Vidarna, one of the "Seven," against Media; Vidarna fought a battle with the Medes at Marush January 20 (Tabitu 27) but, although Darius claims that the opposing general could not hold his position, the victory was not decisive, for Vidarna must wait in Kanpada until Darius was free to assist him.⁷⁷ March 29 (Addaru 7) Vivana won a decisive victory over the detachment sent by Vahyazdata in the district Gandutava; the leader fled to the Arachosian fort Arshada, where he was taken and slain.⁷⁸ April 13 (Addaru 22), the rebels in Parthia and Hyrcania, who had allied themselves with Fravartish of Media, were defeated by Darius' father, Vishtaspa, at Vishpauzatish.⁷⁹

These five engagements are assigned to a little more than two months. Since Darius sent no aid, the two battles of Vivana may have been won in earlier years as may the earlier battles of Vaumisa and Vishtaspa. Probability, however, is in favor of their being fought only after the first capture of Babylon; this probability is increased

⁷⁵ Beh., § 45.

⁷⁶ Beh., § 29; for Izalla, cf. A. T. Olmstead, "The Calculated Frightfulness of Ashurnasir-apal," *J AOS*, XXXVIII (1918), 226, n. 39.

⁷⁷ Beh., § 25. The Babylonian version gives Hambanu, which permits Herzfeld, *Felsreliefs*, p. 190, to prove that the long-known Bit Hamban of the Assyrians lay in the Kermanshah plain, that the name is not only preserved in the Persian Kanpada and the Greek Cambadene, as in Isid. Charac. § 5, the Roman Cambandus, as in Plin. *Hist. nat.* vi. 134, but also the modern Chambatan, as in H. Rawlinson, *Journal of the Royal Geographic Society*, IX (1839), 113. His identification of the Sambulus of Tac. *Ann.* xii. 13 is less happy; the name is preserved in the Sanbula Kuh east of Khanikin.

⁷⁸ Beh., § 46 ff.

⁷⁹ Beh., § 35.

for the first battle of Vaumisa, since Darius would scarcely have sent a general from his little army until Babylon was safe, and it is implied though not directly stated that Vidarna was sent after the capture of that city.

But if these events are to be dated after the capture of Babylon, that is, after December 26, 520, then the revolts must have taken place quite a bit earlier. The assassination of Bardiya, which took place in Media, did not give Darius the homeland Parsa. A claimant to the name Bardiya arose in the person of Vahyazdata of the city Tarava in the district Yautiya, the Utian land of the Greeks; strange to say, the Persian people in the palace (of Cyrus and Cambyses at Parsagada) went over to him, and he became king in Parsa, though his low, broad, projecting nose, round head, and beardless pointed chin proved him no Aryan despite his affectation of the draped robe, laced boots, and curled hair.⁸⁰ Vahyazdata must consolidate his position in Parsa, collect troops, reduce Carmania and Drangiana, and possibly Gedrosia, invade Arachosia, the satrap must hear the news and collect and send out an army, before the first battle was fought on January 6, 519. All this took time, and we begin to realize that Vahyazdata must have become king in Parsa some time before Darius began his march on Babylon; we realize also that his claim to be the living Bardiya would have most plausibility immediately after Darius had murdered the true son of Cyrus.

Darius had murdered Bardiya in Media, yet, soon after, he had lost that country. Although his round head, snub nose, deep-set eyes, prominent cheekbones, and square-cut beard were anything but Aryan, Median Fravartish (Phraortes) took the alternate name of that great Median hero, Khshathrita, of the seed of Uvakhshatra (Cyaxares).⁸¹ Again, strange to observe, this claimant won over the palace troops in Ecbatana. For the moment, Fravartish almost succeeded in restoring the former Median empire. The whole of Media, including the region about Rhages, was his; no leaders are assigned to the revolts in Armenia and Assyria, which also must have been under his influence; Parthia and Hyrcania were invaded. So wide an extent of territory was not brought under his control in a day; he too must have declared himself shortly after the murder of Bardiya, and we wonder whether

⁸⁰ Beh., § 40.

⁸¹ Cf. Cameron, *op. cit.*, pp. 175 ff.

Darius did not invade Babylonia with his "small army" because he was forced out of Media.

Hashshina of Elam had been surrendered before the advance on Babylon—most probably the demand for his surrender was sent while Darius himself was deploying his army from the Zagros Gates. This surrender gave opportunity for a genuine Persian, Martiya, son of Chichikhrish, from Kuganaka in Parsa, to come down the direct road from Parsa to Susa and to proclaim himself Ummannish, name of the Elamite feared by Assyrians as Humbanigash. Darius says he was on the march to Elam when the Elamites in fear slew Martiya. There was an easy road from Babylon to Susa, and Darius was presumably making this detour before striking toward the Zagros Gates. Martiya's death would then have taken place some time after the death of Nebuchadnezzar III, about the end of 520, and before his first battle in Media, April 16 (Nisannu 25), 519, say about March.⁸²

Along the direct road from Susa to Parsa Darius sent a force of Medes and Persians under Artavardiya to attack Vahyazdata.⁸³ He himself with the main army of Persians repassed the Zagros Gates, joined the troops of Vidarna in Kanpada, and on April 16 (Nisannu 25) defeated Fravartish at Kundurush.⁸⁴ Fravartish with a few horsemen escaped to Raga (Rhages) but was pursued and brought back; nose, ears, and tongue were cut off, his eyes were put out, he was exposed in the sight of all until Darius was ready to impale him and to hang his allies in Ecbatana, the stronghold.⁸⁵ The detail with which the punishment is presented gives proof of how serious was the danger from this Mede.⁸⁶

Shortly thereafter we have another group of five "victories." April 28 (Aiaru 8), another Dadarshish, this time an Armenian, defeated his fellow-countrymen at Zuzu.⁸⁷ May 1 (Aiaru 12) Artavardiya de-

⁸² Beh., §§ 22 f.

⁸³ Beh., § 41.

⁸⁴ Beh., § 31; Herzfeld, *loc. cit.*, may be correct in supposing that Darius considered this the decisive battle of his reign and therefore in its memory placed here the Behistun relief and inscriptions.

⁸⁵ Cf. "Ecbatana the stronghold," Ezra 6:2.

⁸⁶ Beh., §§ 31 f.; G. Rawlinson, *Five Ancient Monarchies*, III, 412, connects the revolt of Media, put down in battle, of Herod. i. 130.

⁸⁷ This is the first appearance of Armina (Armenia) in literature. The Babylonian version remembered the Assyrian name Urtu as Urashtu, the Aramaic version uses the familiar biblical form Ararat, which however, should probably be vocalized something like Urtat.

feated Vahyazdata at Rakha of Parsa, not of course the well-known Rhages; Vahyazdata, however, escaped and collected another army at Pishiyauvada. May 7 (Aiaru 18) Dadarshish won his second victory at the fort Tigra. May 19 (Aiaru 30) Vaumisa won another victory in the district Autiyara, the Ti-yari mountains where until our own day the "Assyrians" held a precarious independence. May 28 (Simannu 9) Dadarshish won his third victory at the fort Uyama.⁸⁸ How decisive were these "victories" may be realized from the fact that both Vaumisa and Dadarshish must await the arrival of Darius in person.

Almost immediately after the execution of Fravartish and with Parsa still in revolt, Darius left a part of his army in garrison at Ecbatana and about the first of May hurried north to Rhages. Here he still further depleted his scanty forces to aid his father, even now unsuccessful in bringing under control his own Parthian satrapy. News arrived of the indecisive battles in Assyria and Armenia, and Darius turned west by Lake Urumia and the Rowanduz gorge, reaching Arbela early in June. The eastern portion of Fravartish's empire, Sagartia, seized the opportunity to rise under the Sagartian Chithra-takhma, who like Fravartish claimed to be of the family of Cyaxares. The Persian and Median army, presumably left behind to guard Ecbatana, was dispatched against him under the Mede Takhmaspada and the rebel was taken in battle; led to Arbela and Darius, he suffered the fate of Fravartish.⁸⁹

Darius was now—that is, some time after May 28—in Arbela, capital of Assyria. What did he do thereafter? His autobiography is silent. How was Armenia recovered? Again our record is silent. All the remaining victories cited are victories of his generals. Did the Great King suffer a defeat?

At any rate, Babylonian tablets inform us that within thirty-five days after the last "victory" in Armenia, by July 2 (Duzu 14) Babylon was in revolt under Nebuchadnezzar IV. This raises the suspicion that Darius had indeed suffered a defeat. The news had not yet arrived that on June 20 (Duzu 1) with the aid of the Persian army sent by his son from Raga, Vishtaspa had crushed the rebels at Patigrabana, and Parthia was at last safe.⁹⁰ June 24 (Duzu 5) Artavardiya

⁸⁸ Beh., §§ 42, 26 ff., 30.

⁸⁹ Beh., § 33.

⁹⁰ Beh., § 36.

defeated Vahyazdata and his newly raised army at Mount Parga, and the king of Parsa was impaled at Uvadaichaya.⁹¹ October 24 (Arah-samna 10) is the last tablet dated by Nebuchadnezzar IV; on November 5 (Arahsamna 22) he was defeated and captured.⁹²

This ends the original inscription. Three other satrapies are named in the list of rebels, Sattagydia, Saka, and Egypt;⁹³ there is no record of their conquest. In an appendix we have two more revolts. That of the Elamite . . . mamaita was put down by Gaubaruva (Gobryas), no longer governor of Babylon, and the rebel was captured and brought to Darius, who killed him. There is no date, but as the autobiography was prepared after November 5, 519, the revolt may be placed as early as 518.⁹⁴ Still later was the "revolt" and capture of the Scythian Skunkha; a portion of the inscription already carved was erased to make place for his figure. Whether it is the Persian record of the expedition into Russia made famous by Herodotus as *the* Scythian expedition is, in the terribly mutilated condition of the passage, impossible to determine.⁹⁵ In all probability, however, these additions were made before Darius left for Egypt in 517.

If the Behistun inscription gives no more dates, the Bible does, and our new study of the Behistun chronology demands a renewed discussion of the biblical data. Usually the dates are by the number, not the name of the month, but fortunately we can prove that the year began in post-Exilic Palestine with Nisan, as in Babylonia, and so we may equate the Hebrew and the Babylonian months.⁹⁶

A much more serious question is whether the Hebrews counted the years of Darius as in Babylonia. On first thought, we should answer in the affirmative, and the second year in which most of the prophecies are dated would be 518-517. But it is difficult to believe that Jews in Palestine could be thinking of revolt with aid from Babylonia after all the more important revolts had been put down and Darius was preparing to invade Egypt, which he did in 517. If, as in my *History of Palestine and Syria*, we assume the official dating of the empire, the second year would be 520-519, and everything would fit well; in fact,

⁹¹ Beh., §§ 42 f.

⁹² Strassmaier, *Nab.*, No. 8; Beh., §§ 50 f.

⁹³ Beh., § 21.

⁹⁴ Ushtannu, Gobryas' successor as governor of Babylon, first appears February 27 (Addaru 18), 518, Strassmaier, *Dar.*, No. 27.

⁹⁵ Beh., §§ 71 and 73; Herod. Book iv.

⁹⁶ Zech. 7:1, ninth month, Chislew; Zech. 1:7, eleventh month, Shebat.

with the new chronology of the wars the situation becomes even clearer than in the picture given in that book. It should be noted that, of the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah spoken in that year, two are clear incitements to revolt and naturally were originally not dated by the years of Darius. When the danger of revolt was past, these predictions were preserved, no doubt at first only in dangerous secret, and would then be dated in the official manner, since no other method was possible.

The first biblical date is Nisannu, year two, roughly April, 520, when Zerubbabel was at the court of Darius.⁹⁷ No exception can be taken to this date as appropriate for sending a young man of the old Jewish royal line to keep loyal the Jewish colony in Jerusalem against rebel Egypt, for the whole empire was at war, and the broad promises made him were born of necessity; the essential facts may then be accepted, though the picture of the court with all the satraps feasting is certainly retouching.

Close to five months would be needed for making travel arrangements and for the actual journey. The first prophecy of Haggai, year two, sixth month, first day, August 29, 520,⁹⁸ must have been delivered immediately after the arrival of Zerubbabel and his party. With them would have come the report that Nebuchadnezzar III was safely on the throne of Babylon, that Darius had made no attempt to dethrone him, that most of the provinces were in revolt. The first prophecy dealt only with the rebuilding of the temple, though this in itself might be construed as preliminary to revolt. Work began on the twenty-fourth of the sixth month, September 21;⁹⁹ the altar was rebuilt on the seventh month, first day, September 27.¹⁰⁰ The second prophecy of Haggai came on the twenty-first of the seventh month, October 17, predicting that all nations would be shaken, a clearer indication that revolt was intended. Zechariah began his own preaching in the eighth month, no day given, between October 27 and November 24. Haggai's last prophecy was the twenty-fourth of the ninth month, December 18. Darius was already on his march against Nebuchadnezzar III, but Jerusalem did not know it; Haggai openly urged revolt

⁹⁷ I. Esd. 5:6.

⁹⁸ Hag. 1:1.

⁹⁹ Hag. 1:15.

¹⁰⁰ Ezra 3:1; the date, missing in our present Hebrew text, is determined by the context in the Esdras recension.

to Zerubbabel, Yahweh's signet, and announced overthrow of the thrones of the kingdoms.

Nebuchadnezzar III had been defeated by December 26, but this was unknown in Palestine, and Shebat 24, February 15, 519, was the longest and most specific of Zechariah's predictions. Men from Babylon, come, no doubt, with the knowledge of, if not actually sent by Nebuchadnezzar III, brought crowns for the high priest Joshua and by implication for Zerubbabel, "Seed of Babylon," the "Shoot" of other contemporary prophets. It looks as if actual revolt had broken out.

The "second month, second year of their coming to the house of God in Jerusalem,"¹⁰¹ when the temple foundations were laid, must be the third official year of Darius, April 21, 519. By this time it would have been known that Nebuchadnezzar III was dead and his revolt a failure, though other rebels were still in arms. Zerubbabel is still present but there is no hint of nationalistic revolt. Thereafter followed the opposition of the emigrees brought by the Assyrians. Nebuchadnezzar IV was in revolt, the Jews of Palestine were again suspect. By the time the charges of the emigrees reached Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar IV had been put down and the new governor of Babylon and Ebir Nari or Syria was Ushtannu, Tattenai to the Jews, first mentioned February 27, 518. His demand on the Jews, their reply, the search for Cyrus' decree in Babylon, and its discovery in Ecbatana all took time, and the decree in favor of the Jews could not have been issued long before the appearance of Darius in person. Now that the only serious opposition came from Egypt, loyal Jews in Jerusalem might be an advantage for the projected march of next year, and the decree of Cyrus was confirmed.

Darius passed through Palestine in 517, and thereafter we have no trace of Zerubbabel. In the last dated prophecy of Zechariah, fourth year, fourth day of Chislev, November 24, 517, and obviously after the royal progress, there is no hint of nationalism: the future prosperity of Jerusalem is to be due entirely to the temple. The temple was dedicated Adar third, year six of Darius, March 1, 514; the Pass-over was celebrated April 11, 514.¹⁰² Soon after, the prophecies of

¹⁰¹ Ezra 3:8.

¹⁰² Ezra 6:15 ff.

Haggai and Zechariah were committed to writing, and the official dating was employed.¹⁰³

Whether we like it or not, it seems quite impossible to arrange the evidence from the tablets and from the Behistun inscription in any other fashion. Repeated checks by members of the Oriental Institute staff have only emphasized this impossibility. On the other hand, by this arrangement the intervals detected are so small that the results cannot be accredited to mere coincidence. We must take the results as assured.

But, if these results are accurate, we face another serious difficulty. Darius reigned in *Babylonia* thirty-six years, and this would bring his death to 484. Unfortunately, Strassmaier did not complete his volume of Darius texts, and we have none after the twenty-third year. For this group of British Museum texts, we are therefore reduced to the tables of Boscawen, which give no date after Shabatu 14, year thirty-five.¹⁰⁴ It is our good fortune that four texts published elsewhere are quite decisive, for they all come from Borsippa or Dilbat, that is, from the vicinity of Babylon, and are dated in the thirty-sixth year.¹⁰⁵ The latest date of Darius is Borsippa, Tashritu 27(?), October 15, 484.

Less than a month later, Arahsmna 22, November 10, 484, Borsippa dates from Xerxes,¹⁰⁶ so that the change of monarchs seems to have produced no revolts in Babylon. At first Xerxes employed the usual title "King of Babylon, king of lands," but toward the end of his first year "King of Parsu and Madai," Persia and Media, is prefixed—the variations showing the unfamiliarity of the title. For accession, first and second years, we have a fair number of tablets, thereafter we have but one each for the third, fourth, and fifth, doubtful are two for the sixth, one for the seventh, and one for the eighth. For the remainder of the reign we have only two—one for the twelfth and one for the

¹⁰³ The picture of these events given in my *History of Palestine and Syria*, pp. 560 ff., is not essentially changed. The most important correction is that the proposed Jewish revolt is related to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar III, not Nebuchadnezzar IV.

¹⁰⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 77. That Boscawen's list is by no means complete is shown by his notation that no tablets from year seven have been found (*ibid.*, p. 71). On this evidence, we might suggest that the omission was deliberate, that, as in Palestine, official dating thereafter was by the official year of the empire; but a search of our files shows plenty of tablets from this seventh year, more than twenty from Strassmaier alone!

¹⁰⁵ *VAS*, III, Nos. 164 f.; V, No. 110; IV, No. 180.

¹⁰⁶ *VAS*, V, No. 117.

sixteenth. The single tablets from the third and fourth years still employ the title "King of Babylon," but by the fifth year that title has disappeared forever, and Xerxes is only "king of lands." But this last tablet is dated at Babylon; therefore, despite the abandonment of the age-old title, Babylon was still loyal in June 28 (Duzu 2), 479.¹⁰⁷

Salamis had been fought September 23, 480, but that was merely a naval defeat and meant little to the eastern satrapies. Plataea, August 27, 479, was a much more serious blow to Xerxes, but it was Mycale, traditionally fought on the same day as Plataea, which gave hopes that Persian rule was crumbling; three of the six army corps of the empire had ceased to function, the allied Greeks might be expected to follow up their victories, revolt once more was in the air.

Two rebels in succession attempted to raise Babylonia. Both claimed the titles "King of Babylon, king of lands," or "King of Babylon and of lands." Bel-shimanni appeared at Borsippa Abu 15(?), August 29, if the revolts are to be placed in 478. Probably to be assigned to him is one from Ululu 1, September 14, a third from Borsippa has neither month nor day.¹⁰⁸ Shamash-eriba is found Ululu 25, October 8; another tablet from Borsippa is Ululu, day lost; two others have only accession year, the last are Tashritu 23 and 29. October 22 is therefore Shamash-eriba's last date.¹⁰⁹

We have already seen that Babylon was still in existence June 28, 479; therefore, its destruction must be later. The same tablet proves Babylon still loyal. Thus we must place the revolt after this date, and we have found a good reason for hopes of success in the Persian de-

¹⁰⁷ B. T. A. Evetts, *Inscriptions of the Reigns of Evil Merodach, etc.* (1892), Appen., No. 5.

¹⁰⁸ Pinches, "Notes upon a Collection of Tablets," *Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses* (Hamburg, 1904), p. 268; *VAS*, VI, No. 176; *ibid.*, III, No. 180.

¹⁰⁹ *VAS*, III, Nos. 178-80; VI, Nos. 175, 173 f. Pinches, "Notes upon a Collection . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 268 f., gives another tablet colophon: "Borsippa, Addaru 21, year of beginning of royalty, Shi-kushti(?), king of Babylon, king of lands," and says of it: "The witnesses' names belong to the end of the reign of Darius, and are also found during that of Xerxes." Unfortunately, the owner, Lord Amherst, died before this tablet could be printed in the proposed second volume of the Amherst Tablets, the collection was sold in separate lots, and its whereabouts is unknown. Without the original tablet, it is impossible to do anything with the name read by Pinches as Shi-ku(?) -ush(?) -ti. By the formulas and the witnesses, it should belong to our general period, and we should conjecture to one of our rebels, but no known ruler of this period has a name which by any stretch of the imagination could be miscopied thus. It should perhaps be added that, while the name could with a little good will be identified as Artaxerxes, both formulas and witnesses prohibit the conjecture.

feats at Salamis, Plataea, and Mycale. That the destruction of Babylon took place late in 478 or early in 477 is not absolutely certain but cannot be far wrong.¹¹⁰

If this article has not solved all the problems, it has utilized all the available evidence, and the main outlines may be considered certain. New evidence will doubtless fill the gaps. Meanwhile, the results may be given in tabular form, for the best proof of the argument is the manner in which these results fit together.

¹¹⁰ It is generally assumed that the revolts took place at the death of Darius, but this is absolutely impossible. If we make such an assumption, we should have Bel-shimanni in Borsippa Abu 15, Darius in Abu 28 at the same city, apparently Bel-shimanni Ululu 1, Darius at Dilbat Ululu 13 and 19, Shamash-eriba Ululu 25, and at Borsippa during the month, and appearing also on Tashritu 23 and 29, Darius is at Borsippa Tashritu 27—all of which is obviously absurd.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Event	Date B.C.	Regnal Year	Month	Day	Source
Bardiya, Revolt.	522, Mar. 11		XII	14	Beh. § 11
Cambyses, Last Date.	Apr. 29	VIII	I	23	Strass., <i>Camb.</i> , 409
Bardiya, First Date.	May 8	Access.	II	Strass., <i>ZA</i> , IV, 1
Bardiya, Accession.	Jul. 1		IV	9	Beh. § 11
Bardiya, Death.	521, Oct. 17		VII	10	Beh. § 13
Bardiya, Last Date.	Nov. 17	I	VIII	11	Pinches, <i>BOR</i> , I (1887), 51
Nebuchadnezzar III, First Date	Dec. 12	Access.	IX	7	Krückmann, 6
Hashshina, Revolt, Death.					Beh. § 17
Zerubbabel at Court.	520, Apr. 3	II	I	I Esd. 5:6
Haggai, Prophecy I.	Aug. 29	II	VI	1	Hag. 1:1
Work on Temple Begins.	Sep. 21	II	VI	24	Hag. 1:15
Altar Rebuilt.	Sep. 27		VII	1	Ezra 3:1
Nebuchadnezzar III, Last Date.	Oct. 12	I	VII	16	Strass., <i>Nab.</i> , 17
Haggai, Prophecy II.	Oct. 17	II	VII	21	Hag. 2:1
Zechariah, Prophecy I.	Oct. 27	II	VIII	Zech. 1:1
Frada, Defeat.	Dec. 17		IX	23	Beh. § 38
Haggai, Prophecy III.	Dec. 18	II	IX	24	Hag. 2:10
Nebuchadnezzar III, Battle.	Dec. 20		IX	26	Beh. § 18
Nebuchadnezzar III, Defeat.	Dec. 26		X	2	Beh. § 19
Darius, First Date.	Dec. 30	Access.	X	6	Weissbach, 16
Arachosia, Battle I.	519, Jan. 6		X	13	Beh. § 45
Assyria, Battle I.	Jan. 8		X	15	Beh. § 29
Fravartish, Battle I.	Jan. 20		X	27	Beh. § 25
Zechariah, Prophecy II.	Feb. 15	II	XI	24	Zech. 1:7
Martiya, Death.	(March)				Beh. § 23
Arachosia, Battle II.	Mar. 29		XII	7	Beh. § 46
Darius Marches from Babylon. .	(March)				
Parthia, Battle I.	Apr. 13		XII	22	Beh. § 35
Fravartish, Defeat, Death.	Apr. 16		I	25	Beh. §§ 31 f.
Temple Foundations Laid.	Apr. 21		II	Ezra 3:8
Armenia, Battle I.	Apr. 28		II	8	Beh. § 26
Vahyazdata, Battle I.	May 1		II	12	Beh. § 41
Armenia, Battle II.	May 7		II	18	Beh. § 27
Armenia, Battle III.	May 19		II	30	Beh. § 30
Armenia, Battle IV.	May 28		III	9	Beh. § 28
Darius at Rhages.	(May)				Beh. § 36
Darius Leaves for Arbela.	(June)				Beh. § 33
Chithratakhma, Revolt.	(June)				Beh. § 33
Chithratakhma, Capture.					Beh. § 33
Chithratakhma, Death at Arbela					Beh. § 33
Parthia, Battle II.	June 20		IV	1	Beh. § 36
Vahyazdata, Defeat.	June 24		IV	5	Beh. § 42
Nebuchadnezzar IV, First Date.	July 2	Access.	IV	14	Ungnad, <i>ZA</i> , XIX
Opposition to Temple Building					Ezra 4:1
Nebuchadnezzar IV, Last Date	Oct. 24	Access.	VIII	10	Strass., <i>Nab.</i> , 8
Nebuchadnezzar IV, Defeat.	Nov. 5		VIII	22	Beh. § 50
Ushattu, First Date.	518, Feb. 27	I	XII	18	Strass., <i>Dar.</i> , 27
Ushattu, Demand on Jews.					Ezra 5:3
Darius, Decree to Jews.					Ezra 6:1
.... mamaita, Revolt, Death. .					Beh. § 71
Darius, Indian Expedition.					

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE—*Continued*

Event	Date B.C.	Regnal Year	Month	Day	Source
Darius, Egyptian Expedition...	517				
Zechariah, Last Prophecy.....	Nov. 24	IV	IX	4	Zech. 7:1
Temple Dedicated.....	514, Mar. 1	VI	XII	3	Ezra 6:15
Passover.....	Apr. 11		I	14	Ezra 6:19
Darius, Last Date.....	484, Oct. 15		VII	27	VAS, IV, 180
Xerxes, First Date.....	Nov. 10		VIII	22	VAS, V, 117
Xerxes, Salamis.....	480, Sep. 23				
Xerxes, Last Date from Babylon	479, June 28	V	IV	2	Evetts, 5
Xerxes, Plataea, Mycale.....	Aug. 27				
Bel-shimanni, First Date.....	478, Aug. 29	Access.	V	15	Pinches, <i>Congr.</i>
Bel-shimanni, Last Date.....	Sep. 14	Access.	VI	1	VAS, VI, 176
Shamash-eriba, First Date.....	Oct. 8	Access.	VI	25	VAS, III, 178
Shamash-eriba, Last Date.....	Nov. 10	Access.	VII	29	VAS, VI, 174
Destruction of Babylon.....					

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO